



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/581,774	03/14/2007	Antonio Augusto Da Silva Rodrigues	SC3	8554
22884	7590	08/17/2009	EXAMINER	
MIDDLETON & REUTLINGER 2500 BROWN & WILLIAMSON TOWER LOUISVILLE, KY 40202				WU, VICKI H
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1791				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/17/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/581,774	RODRIGUES ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	VICKI WU	1791

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 06 June 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/16/2007</u>	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

This is a non-final Office action in response to the claims submitted on 6/06/2006.

Objections to Specification

The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

Arrangement of the Specification

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

- (a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
- (b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
- (c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
- (d) THE NAMES OF THE PARTIES TO A JOINT RESEARCH AGREEMENT.
- (e) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC.
- (f) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.

(1) Field of the Invention.

(2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.

(g) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.

(h) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).

(i) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.

(j) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).

(k) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).

(l) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A

“Sequence Listing” is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required “Sequence Listing” is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

The underlined headings to the following section(s) are missing in the specification and must be included:

Content of Specification

(f) Background of the Invention: See MPEP § 608.01(c). The specification should set forth the Background of the Invention in two parts:

(1) Field of the Invention: A statement of the field of art to which the invention pertains. This statement may include a paraphrasing of the applicable U.S. patent classification definitions of the subject matter of the claimed invention. This item may also be titled "Technical Field."

(g) Brief Summary of the Invention: See MPEP § 608.01(d). A brief summary or general statement of the invention as set forth in 37 CFR 1.73. The summary is separate and distinct from the abstract and is directed toward the invention rather than the disclosure as a whole. The summary may point out the advantages of the invention or how it solves problems previously existent in the prior art (and preferably indicated in the Background of the Invention). In chemical cases it should point out in general terms the utility of the invention. If possible, the nature and gist of the invention or the inventive concept should be set forth. Objects of the invention should be treated briefly and only to the extent that they contribute to an understanding of the invention.

(h) Brief Description of the Several Views of the Drawing(s): See MPEP § 608.01(f). A reference to and brief description of the drawing(s) as set forth in 37 CFR 1.74.

(i) Detailed Description of the Invention: See MPEP § 608.01(g). A description of the preferred embodiment(s) of the invention as required in 37 CFR 1.71. The description should be as short and specific as is necessary to describe the invention adequately and accurately. Where elements or groups of elements, compounds, and processes, which are conventional and generally widely known in the field of the invention described and their exact nature or type is not necessary for an understanding and use of the invention by a person skilled in the art, they should not be described in detail. However, where particularly complicated subject matter is involved or where the elements, compounds, or processes may not be commonly or widely known in the field, the specification should refer to another patent or readily available publication which adequately describes the subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3, 17-22, 25, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by WO 0128368 A1 (Grzonka).

Regarding claim 1, Grzonka teaches a smoking article comprising a rod of smokable material wrapped in a wrapper, the rod comprising two discrete segments in substantially end-to-end abutment (2 and 3; Figure 1), one of the segments comprising an encapsulated flavourant incorporated within a component of the smokable material (Detailed Description: pg. 2 paragraph 7).

Regarding claim 3, Grzonka teaches that the segment comprising encapsulated flavourant therein is towards the mouth end of the smoking article (2; Figure 1).

Regarding claim 17, Grzonka teaches that the smoking article comprises a filter element (1, 2, Figure 1; Abstract).

Regarding claims 18-22, Grzonka teaches a smoking article comprising a flavourant (Detailed Description: pg. 2 paragraph 7) comprising two discrete segments (1 and 2; Figure 1) wherein the two discrete segments are individually circumscribed by a wrapper (9, Figure 4), and the two discrete segments are joined entirely by a wrapper (Figure 2); furthermore, the outmost wrapper indicates to the consumer the point at which the taste and aroma characteristics of the smoking article will be modified when being smoked (Detailed Description: pg. 2 paragraph 8), may be colored (Detailed Description: pg. 3 paragraph 3), and joins the filter element to a segment towards the mouth end of the smoking article (Figure 2).

Regarding claims 25, 29-35, Grzonka teaches a method of making a smoking article comprising incorporating an encapsulated flavourant within a component of a smokable material (Detailed Description: pg. 2 paragraph 7; 1, 2, Figure 1) and forming the smokable material into a first segment (2; Figure 1), and joining the segment in substantially end-to-end abutment with a second segment to form a rod of smokable material (2, 3; Figure 1).

Grzonka further teaches the smoking article comprising two discrete filter segments (1 and 2; Figure 1) wherein the two discrete segments are individually circumscribed by a wrapper (9, Figure 4), the rod of smokable material is joined to a filter element with a wrapper (Figure 2), the first segment is joined to the second segment with a wrapper (Figure 2), the second segment is joined to the first segment with a wrapper that circumscribes entirely the filter element and the first segment (Figure 2), and the second segment is joined to the first segment by a wrapper that only partially circumscribes each of the first and second segments (8; Figure 1); furthermore, Grzonka teaches the outmost wrapper indicates to the consumer the point at which the taste and aroma characteristics of the smoking article will be modified when being smoked (Detailed Description: pg. 2 paragraph 8), and may be colored (Detailed Description: pg. 3 paragraph 3).

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 6,475,288 (Oliver).

Regarding claim 1, Oliver teaches a smoking article comprising a rod of smokable material wrapped in a wrapper, the rod comprising two discrete segments in substantially end-to-end abutment (50 and 52; Figure 6), one of the segments comprising an encapsulated flavourant incorporated within a component of the smokable material (2, Figure 6; col. 7 lines 60-65).

Regarding claim 2, Oliver teaches that the rod of smokable material comprises only two segments (Figure 6).

Regarding claim 4, Oliver teaches that the segment is the only segment containing encapsulated flavourant therein (2, Figure 6; col. 7 lines 64-65).

Regarding claim 5, Oliver teaches that the flavourant is menthol (col. 7 lines 64-65).

Regarding claim 6, Oliver teaches that the flavourant is encapsulated within alginate, a polysaccharide (col. 7 lines 64-65; col. 8 Claim 1).

Regarding claim 17, Oliver teaches that said smoking article comprises a filter element (52; Figure 6).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grzonka in view of US Patent Application Publication 2005/0039767 A1 (Mua).

Regarding claims 7-13, the limitations of Grzonka are detailed above in the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b). Grzonka does not expressly disclose that an inert material, a carbonate, is applied onto the encapsulated flavourant to reduce particulate matter delivered to the consumer during smoke of the smoking article, or that the encapsulated material is incorporated within smokable material that comprises extruded reconstituted tobacco material, said reconstituted tobacco material comprising tobacco

dust and 20-50% of the smokable material of a segment, and specifically the tobacco dust comprising 30-70% of the reconstituted tobacco material.

Mua teaches a smoking article whose smokable material is comprised of reconstituted tobacco material, in which an inert material, a carbonate, is incorporated into a slurry of reconstituted tobacco material along with a flavourant, menthol, to be encapsulated together within the resulting smoking article (pg. 7 paragraph 0052); the resulting smoking article comprises 30% reconstituted tobacco material (pg. 7 paragraph 0053) and more specifically 30-70% tobacco dust (pg. 8 paragraph 0061), said reconstituted tobacco material also have been extruded (pg. 10 paragraph 0079).

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the specific smokable material of Mua to modify the smoking article of Grzonka. The rationale to do so would have been the motivation provided by the teaching of the advantages to using the specific smokable material of Mua; that in using said specific smokable material to make the smoking article, the resulting smoking articles maintain their flavor in open packs for significant periods of time, up to 1 month; in sealed packs, they maintain their flavor for at least 4 months (Mua: pg. 7 paragraph 0052).

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grzonka in view of US Patent 4,785,833 (Holzner).

Regarding claim 14, the limitations of Grzonka are detailed above in the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b). Grzonka does not expressly disclose that the flavourant is included in an amount of 200 to 50,000 parts per million (ppm).

Holzner teaches a process for flavoring tobacco that comprises generally using about 200 ppm of flavourant, including menthol, to flavor tobacco (col. 4 lines 1-16; col. 6 Example 7).

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the amount of flavourant of Holzner to modify the smoking article of Grzonka. The rationale to do so would have been the motivation provided by the teaching of the advantages of using the amount of flavourant discussed in Holzner; that in using said amount, the flavor quality and effect of the flavored tobacco would generally be very satisfactory to most consumers (Holzner: col. 4 lines 13-16).

Claims 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grzonka in view of US Patent 4,595,024 (Greene).

Regarding claims 15 and 16, the limitations of Grzonka are detailed above in the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b). Grzonka does not expressly disclose that the length of each discrete segment of the smoking article is 10-90% of the total length

of the rod of smokable material, or that the length of each discrete segment is 40-60% of the total length of the rod of smokable material.

Greene teaches a cigarette comprising a tobacco rod of two discrete segments (Abstract) in which each discrete segment of the smoking article is 50% of the total length of the rod of smokable material (col. 4 lines 49-52).

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the discrete tobacco-rod segment lengths of Greene to modify the smoking article of Grzonka. The rationale to do so would have been the motivation provided by the teaching of the advantages of incorporating the specific lengths of the tobacco-rod segments of Greene; that incorporating said lengths of the tobacco-rod segments helps the resulting smoking article to reach its maximum utilization in providing more desirable puff-by-puff nicotine delivery that involves a larger amount of nicotine in the first few puffs of the cigarette than in the last few puffs, as well as desirably essentially uniform nicotine delivery during the middle to last puffs (Greene: col. 2 lines 20-29).

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grzonka in view of US Patent 4,587,982 (Adams).

Regarding Claim 23, the teachings of the limitations of Grzonka are detailed in the rejection of claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) above. However, Grzonka does not expressly disclose that said wrapper is a conventional cigarette wrapper, a tipping wrapper, a pretipping wrapper or a plugwrap.

Adams teaches a smoking article which is wrapped in a ventilated tipping wrapper (Abstract).

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the specific tipping wrapper of Adams to modify the smoking article of Grzonka. The rationale to do so would have been the motivation provided by the teaching of the advantages of using the specific tipping wrapper of Adams; that said tipping wrapper is ventilated to provide a desired flow of ventilating air to the smoker's mouth (Adams: col. 1 lines 6-10); additionally, said specific tipping wrapper may be produced easily and economically (Adams: col. 5 lines 1-3) due to the means of printing specific patterns on said specific tipping paper (Adams: col. 6 Claim 9).

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grzonka in view of Greene and in further view of US Patent 5,137,036 (Southwick).

Regarding claim 24, the teachings of the limitations of Grzonka in view of Greene are detailed in the rejection of claims 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) above. However,

Grzonka in view of Greene does not expressly disclose that an adhesive used to secure the wrapper comprises an encapsulated flavourant therein.

Southwick teaches a smoking article comprising an adhesive used to secure the wrapper that comprises an encapsulated flavourant therein (col. 8 Claim 14).

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the specific adhesive of Southwick to modify the smoking article of Grzonka in view of Greene. The rationale to do so would have been the motivation provided by the teaching of the advantages of using the specific adhesive of Southwick; that said specific adhesive provides a flavorant-release component which is characterized by a lack of mobility and / or volatility at ambient temperature, and under normal smoking conditions imparts improved aroma to sidestream smoke (Southwick: col. 2 lines 1-10).

Claims 26, 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grzonka in view of Mua.

Regarding claims 26 and 27, the teachings of the limitations of Grzonka are detailed above under the rejection of Claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b). Grzonka does not expressly disclose that the encapsulated flavourant is incorporated within a

reconstituted tobacco material, wherein the reconstituted tobacco material is produced by an extrusion process.

Mua teaches a smoking article whose smokable material is comprised of reconstituted tobacco material, in which a flavourant, menthol, is encapsulated within the smoking article (pg. 7 paragraph 0052), said reconstituted tobacco material also have been extruded (pg. 10 paragraph 0079).

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the specific smokable material of Mua to modify the smoking article of Grzonka. The rationale to do so would have been the motivation provided by the teaching of the advantages to using the specific smokable material of Mua; that in using said specific smokable material to make the smoking article, the resulting smoking article maintain their flavor in open packs for significant periods of time, up to 1 month; in sealed packs, they maintain their flavor for at least 4 months (Mua: pg. 7 paragraph 0052).

Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grzonka in view of Oliver.

Regarding Claim 28, the teachings of the limitations of Grzonka are detailed above under the rejection of Claims 25 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b). Grzonka does not expressly

disclose that the encapsulated flavourant is encapsulated in a polysaccharide, a starch, a cyclodextrin or an adsorbent.

Oliver teaches a smoking article comprising a rod of smokable material wrapped in a wrapper, the rod comprising two discrete segments in substantially end-to-end abutment (50 and 52; Figure 6), one of the segments comprising an encapsulated flavourant incorporated within a component of the smokable material (2, Figure 6; col. 7 lines 60-65), said encapsulated flavourant being encapsulated within alginate, a polysaccharide (col. 7 lines 64-65; col. 8 Claim 1).

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the specific flavourant-encapsulating material of Oliver to modify the smoking article of Grzonka. The rationale to do so would have been the motivation provided by the teaching of the advantages of using said specific flavourant-encapsulating material of Oliver; that in using said specific flavourant-encapsulating material, the migration of significant amounts of the encapsulated flavourants from the filament (which results in losses of such agents) is decreased, and said material also helps prevent the volatilization of said flavourants at ambient temperatures (Oliver: col. 1 lines 20-27; col. 3 lines 62-65).

Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grzonka in view of Southwick.

Regarding Claim 36, the teachings of the limitations of Grzonka are detailed above under the rejection of Claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b). Grzonka does not expressly disclose an encapsulated flavourant mixed with an adhesive, the adhesive being applied to the wrapper to secure the wrapper in position.

Southwick teaches a smoking article comprising an adhesive used to secure the wrapper that comprises an encapsulated flavourant mixed therein (col. 8 Claim 14).

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the specific adhesive of Southwick to modify the smoking article of Grzonka. The rationale to do so would have been the motivation provided by the teaching of the advantages of using the specific adhesive of Southwick; that said specific adhesive provides a flavorant-release component which is characterized by a lack of mobility and / or volatility at ambient temperature, and under normal smoking conditions imparts improved aroma to sidestream smoke (Southwick: col. 2 lines 1-10).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VICKI WU whose telephone number is (571)270-7666. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30 am-6:30 pm), every other Fri. off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Del Sole can be reached on 571-272-1130. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/V.W./
Patent Examiner, TC 1791

/Joseph S. Del Sole/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1791